

Appl. No. 10/708,152  
Amdt. dated July 25, 2005  
Reply to Office action of July 05, 2005

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. Rejection of claims 1-6, 8, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b):

Claims 1-6, 8, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Cornell et al (US 5,774,148) for reasons of record.

5

**Response:**

Claim 1 has been amended to overcome this rejection. Claim 1 now contains the limitation "forming a first conductive trace, the first conductive trace formed of poly-silicon". This amendment is fully supported in the specification, and no new matter has been added. This amendment to claim 1 has been made to specify that the first conductive trace is formed out of poly-silicon, and does not contain a separate poly-silicon layer. In addition, claims 14 and 15 have been amended to agree with the changes made to claim 1.

10

15

On the other hand, Cornell does not teach that the first conductive trace is formed of poly-silicon. Instead, Cornell teaches in col.5, line 14 that the first conductive trace 46 is an aluminum-copper alloy. As shown in Cornell's Fig.5, the conductive layer 46 and the poly-silicon 38 are two separate layers. Therefore, it cannot be said that the conductive layer 46 is formed of poly-silicon, as is recited in the currently amended claim 1. For these reasons, the applicant submits that Cornell does not anticipate all of the limitations of claim 1, and reconsideration of claim 1 is respectfully requested. Claims 1-6, 8, and 14 are dependent on claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is allowed. Reconsideration of claims 1-6, 8, and 14 is respectfully requested.

20

25

2. Rejection of claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cornell et al in view of Shirai (US 5,422,505) for reasons of record.

Appl. No. 10/708,152  
Amdt. dated July 25, 2005  
Reply to Office action of July 05, 2005

**Response:**

Claim 7 is dependent on claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is allowed.  
Reconsideration of claim 7 is requested.

5

**3. Rejection of claims 9-11 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):**

Claims 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over  
Cornell et al in view of Kim et al (US 6,102,530) for reasons of record.

10 **Response:**

Claims 9-11 are dependent on claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is  
allowed. Reconsideration of claims 9-11 is requested.

**4. Rejection of claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):**

15 Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cornell  
et al in view of Hess et al (US 5,122,812) for reasons of record.

**Response:**


20 Claim 13 is dependent on claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is allowed.  
Reconsideration of claim 13 is requested.

In view of the above arguments in favor of patentability, the applicant respectfully  
requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

25

Appl. No. 10/708,152  
Amdt. dated July 25, 2005  
Reply to Office action of July 05, 2005

Respectfully submitted,



Date: July 25, 2005

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526

5 P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.

Voice Mail: 302-729-1562

Facsimile: 806-498-6673

e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

- 10 Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. The time in D.C. is 12 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 9 PM in Taiwan.